SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

26th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXVI, No. 20 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © December 15, 1996

On the Eve of Clinton II, The Fiscal Cupboard Is Bare

"There's no money," or words to that effect, is the common refrain in federal research agencies and elsewhere in the government as Washington awaits the opening of the second Clinton Administration.

Actually, there's a lot of money—$1.5 trillion or so—that the government will spend in the current fiscal year, 1997, which runs to September 30. A similar amount will be in the budget for 1998, which the President will send to Congress in February. But it's from that slender slice known as civilian discretionary spending—totaling about $250 billion—that the research agencies draw their support in common with housing programs, veterans assistance, agricultural supports and other civilian activities. And, in plans deemed irreversible by Congress and the President, the discretionary sum is destined to shrink substantially in the march to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

According to an analysis by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Clinton plan, which is the less severe of the two, translates into a 5.2 percent reduction in purchasing power for civilian research in fiscal 1998. From the baseline of 1995, the AAAS calculates the decline to 2002 would total 24.5 percent, again in real terms.

Non-Profit Pay Checks: FASEB—P.5
NSF Rewrites Grant Criteria—P.6

So far, only the National Institutes of Health has eluded the budget plan, thanks to the popularity of health research, vigorous lobbying by the biomedical community, and well-placed friends in Congress.

However, NASA—with a real 3-4 percent budget cut this year—is running out of money, and is hoping for relief from a White House-Congressional "space summit" in February [SGR, December 1]. The NSF budget this year went up by 1.6 percent, a loss to inflation. Internal juggling provided a 5.1 percent increase for NSF research, mainly at the cost of funds for academic research infrastructure. Other research agencies experienced losses or, at best, minor gains in funding.

With no grounds for optimism, the chiefs of the research agencies are reduced to noting that the President has recently spoken approvingly of research and science. However, he hasn't said anything about more money for research, though he has reiterated his commitment to a balanced budget.

Asked at a press briefing whether R&D might be partially exempted from the deficit-cutting drive, John Gibbons, the President's Science and Technology Advisor, replied, "Everyone has to carry part of that load." He added that "there's not much left to cut, except bone and muscle."

Q&A: NIH Chief Varmus on Prospects for the 2d Term

Harold Varmus, Director of the National Institutes of Health, spoke to SGR Editor Greenberg on December 2. Following is the text, transcribed and edited by SGR.

•

SGR. *What's different for NIH as a result of the election?*

Varmus. Most significant to us is that Senators Kassebaum, Hatfield, and a few other strong supporters of NIH—of what we do and with a deep understanding of how we do it—have retired. That's a blow. Otherwise, I'd say things are very similar. I'm hoping that this, being the second term, the President will be looking for ways to make a lasting impact on America and global society and will be looking to the investment areas—research, education.

SGR. Have you had signals from the Administration?

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Staying or leaving? White House Science and Technology Advisor John Gibbons says, "I have no plans to leave government at this time." Has the President given him a sign, Gibbons was asked December 3 when he met with half a dozen science reporters in his office. "I haven't talked to the President yet about a second term," he replied, and went on to remind his guests that he has renewed the lease on his Washington apartment.

NSF's research programs at the South Pole and vicinity will receive an on-site inspection December 29 through January 3 by an 11-member panel chaired by Norman Augustine, CEO of Lockheed Martin. The review was requested by the White House National Science and Technology Council to examine ways to maintain the Antarctic program "under realistic constrained funding levels."

Colleges and universities should be encouraged to avoid state sales taxes on purchases financed by NSF grants, says the latest report of the NSF Office of Inspector General. Recommending the "use of creative strategies to legally avoid these tax payments," the IG suggests as a possibility "structuring a major equipment purchase so that the title vests in NSF, rather than in the awardee." Only five states impose such taxes, the report says. "Legal avoidance," it estimates, could save NSF about $4 million a year. The IG report, No. 15, is available without charge from: Office of Inspector General, NSF, Arlington, Virgina 22230; tel. 703/306-2100; fax 703/306-0649.

Harold Liebowitz, ousted from the Presidency of the National Academy of Engineering by an unprecedented recall vote, has accepted a payoff of $687,500 from the NAE in settlement of all claims he might make against the NAE, its officers and staff.

. . . Mistakes in the Conflict Over 'Embryo' Research

(Continued from Page 1)

Varmus. I think we had some signals in the campaign. The President talked much more about science and technology. A number of explicit statements were made in his speeches about the importance of medical research and there was a clear endorsement of many of the things we're doing here, in genetics and breast cancer research, AIDS research, and other areas that are very important to us.

SGR. *In the preceding three and a half years, he scarcely mentioned NIH.*

Varmus. I would say, not frequently in public addresses. But he's certainly aware of what goes on here. He's been here, and he's been supportive of the Secretary [of Health and Human Services, parent agency of NIH].

SGR. *You've had many accomplishments here. Any disappointments?*

Varmus. Not any major ones. I've learned some lessons.

SGR. *Like what?*

Varmus. Well, I've learned something about how to run an organization.

SGR. *You never ran anything big previously.*

Varmus. Nothing. I ran my own lab. That's all. I've learned about how to avoid fights over nothing.

SGR. *What's a fight over nothing?*

Varmus. Those of us who did not grow up in politics are used to voicing our opinions, even when they're not based on very much. The gratuitous comment that doesn't have any particular purpose can backfire.

SGR. *So you pick your fights?*

Varmus. You try to pick your fights. And you know, there have been a couple of fights that we haven't won. I still believe that we should be doing research on conception, fertilization and the growth of the early human embryo. We don't have the freedom to do that at this point. At the moment, we're operating under the Dickey Amendment [introduced by Rep. Jay Dickey (R-Arkansas), prohibiting federal funding of embryo research]. One change in the recent Congress is the departure of Mr. Dornan [Rep. Robert Dornan, an extreme right-wing California Republican, defeated for reelection], who was one of the most strident anti-embryo-research activists.

I think a mistake was made in that whole operation, a mistake that I inherited, but perhaps could have caught if I were more savvy. And that is that the label that was put on that research was a bad label—calling it human-embryo research, inviting trouble, when, in fact, what that research entails is the study of the process of fertilization and the first two or three or four divisions of a pre-implantation embryo.

SGR. *Do you think a bit of semantic guile could have...?*

Varmus. I wouldn't say it was guile. What we were using was a term that to the layman invited thoughts of little children floating in petri dishes, as opposed to what was really under study. That's not to say that everyone is happy about studying fertilization or studying a one- or two- or four-cell embryo. But I think there's a very large segment of the population which lives with an ethic that would be compatible with studying the early embryo and would be receptive to understanding the potential medical benefits, with respect to transplantation and the development of new contraceptive devices that could flow from pursuit of that research; and also would be receptive to the idea that research is going on in the private sector, and government should do this work, as well.

SGR. *Why, if it is going on in the private sector?*

Varmus. Because of the quality of the work that we tend to support. It's all peer-reviewed research. Because a lot of the private work is directed toward relatively short-term goals of simply improving *in vitro* fertilization methods for non-fertile couples. Important work, but it doesn't explore all the ramifications that I think are very important.

SGR. *Do you think the new Congress might be more hospitable to this research?*

Varmus. I don't know. I don't see any reason to believe it would be much more.

SGR. *There's just been a tempest in a teapot about your attempt to eliminate the Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee [RAC].*

Varmus. Yes, I agree, tempest in a teapot. I think I may have made an error there, too. Debatable, but my intentions were, first of all, to get the approval process out of our oversight and to have a smaller committee. And we will now have that, and I think everyone is going to be happy with it. I tried to do it in a way that had clarity, by saying that we'll replace RAC with something smaller that advises my Recombinant DNA Office [in the NIH Office of Science Policy]. I underestimated the strength of nostalgia and tradition. And if I had to do it over again, I'd probably do it a little differently. But, on the other hand, I think it's all going to work out for the best. It's been an occasion for me to show that when I publish something in the *Federal Register*, I do read the responses and I respond to them. I like to follow the democratic process. I got some thoughtful letters, and I'm doing something that I think is probably going to make people happier. Having people responsive and on-board with these things is important. It's the enthusiasm of the people on these committees that determines whether or not they

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1996, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher **Daniel S. Greenberg** Associate Publisher **Wanda J. Reif**
Circulation Manager **Glen D. Grant**

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $490.00 (two years, $840.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . A Surge in Applications for Research Posts at NIH

(Continued from Page 2)
work.

SGR. *The rest of the US government is shrinking, while NIH has had real growth. Can this go on?*

Varmus. We're optimistic, based on what we've seen year-to-year for the last few years. Nevertheless, one can't close one's eyes to the multi-year projections to 2002 that both the Congress and the Administration have laid down. So, while we understand the need to balance the budget, we're apprehensive about what a five-year shrinkage of science and technology would mean, not just for NIH but for all the agencies that support science. I've been pointing out that we're very dependent upon science done by the NSF and DOE and the Army. Chemistry, physics, computer science, mathematics—these are essential disciplines for us, especially as our science gets harder, in the sense of depending more on technologies that ten years ago didn't matter to us.

SGR. *Other agencies complain that there's very little growth in federal science money, and NIH is getting a disproportionate share of it.*

Varmus. First of all, we don't determine who gets more and who gets less. Secondly, it's not the other science agencies that are hurt by our success. What we're concerned about is our partners at HHS and how they are treated. But given the political and economic constraints upon all of us, the other agencies also have to find ways to link what they do to popular concerns, societal concerns. I think it's not that hard to do it. We obviously have a leg up because health is so important to everybody. But it's not so difficult to explain why science is good for the country.

SGR. *Even with growth at NIH, terrible financial strains are reported throughout bomedical-research.*

Varmus. As long as we have success rates [for grant applicants] that are around 25 or 30 percent, some people are going to be unfairly treated because there will always be grant applications that should have succeeded and didn't. Peer review is not perfect. And there will be complaints. I think this should always remain a competitive business. I don't subscribe to systems, such as exist in some countries in Europe, where an investigator, once endowed with a certain kind of position, such as in CNRS [the government science agency] in France, always has money to do research.

SGR. *Why should 25-percent success be considered low?*

Varmus. From the experiences that many of us have had on study sections, where the general sense is that something in the order of a third of the applications are really good enough to be funded, and that you're beginning to make arbitrary decisions when the rates go lower. The other point is that we have a lot more people in the system long-term, and the success rate is a combination of renewal and new applications. In general, the success rate for a competitive renewal is about two times higher than it is for a new investigator. New applications may more likely be innovative, and certainly are more likely to come from young investigators, and are less likely to be funded. The success rate for new investigators tends to be around 15 percent.

SGR. *The intramural program has been shrunk a good deal. Have we seen the end of that or is there more to come?*

Varmus. Shrinking is not quite the right term. It is decreasing slightly as a proportion of the overall budget. The number of people has declined somewhat, but the amount of money we spend has gone up in real dollars. The important thing is that we've revitalized the program in many ways. It's always had a lot of strength. But it had some serious weaknesses in the method of review and the implementation of recommendations of review, the hiring process, promotions process. These were obscure, not inviting to people on the outside. What I look to now as a source of great strength is the number of people who are trying to get positions here.

SGR. *Has there been a big increase in applications?*

Varmus. Oh, tremendous. It's just like competing for a job at Harvard and Princeton. In fact, we have essentially the same set of applicants. When we advertise a job here in a strong intramural program, we get hundreds of applicants. Some of my own postdoctoral fellows have applied for these positions, and sometimes been rejected. They get close, and then the job goes to somebody else.

SGR. *Why has there been this increase?*

Varmus. People now understand that the NIH does invite applications for these positions. The positions are good. In the past, people felt the place had become sufficiently ingrown that the jobs tended to go to people who were already postdocs at the NIH. And now that sometimes happens, because we have some good postdocs here who can compete effectively for these positions. It's also been advantageous to make it much clearer to the people who are in the program here that they're not guaranteed to stay on.

SGR. *Industry now far surpasses the federal government as a supporter of research and development. What are the implications for NIH?*

Varmus. One issue for us is how do we make the best use of the resources we have in a way that doesn't overlap with the goals of industry. And we see this most clearly at NIH in the realm of clinical trials. We'd like to believe that we are not doing the clinical trials that industry should do, but, of course, inevitably, there probably are some that industry should be paying for. Our investment in clinical research ranges somewhere between $1.2 billion and $4.7 billion. We're trying to figure out exactly what the number is. At our latest Clinical Research Panel meeting, the number was thought to be somewhere in the 30-something percent range for our investment in clinical research activities. Some relief in that area would help us a lot. It's not just a matter of being relieved. We'd like to build partnerships with managed care so that we're spending more money in total.

SGR. *Can you get them to pay for it?*

Varmus. We're trying to work with managed care to

(Continued on Page 4)

. . . Searching for Partners to Share Research Costs

(Continued from Page 3)

develop a clearer sense of our joint interests and to convince them that there's benefit to them, to us, to the country if they help sponsor the kinds of research that they're uniquely equipped to do, such as epidemiological studies, large clinical trials, health-services research and outcomes studies. Another issue for us is how we share investigators. It's become clear in the last few years that the amount of industrial money on the campuses that we tend to support most heavily has increased appreciably, from just a couple of percent to as high as 15 or 20 percent on some campuses. In general, that doesn't pose any major problem for us. But it can pose a problem, especially in the areas of tech transfer and intellectual property, when companies are asking for too much from investigators who are also supported by NIH. But we surveyed some years ago the so-called sponsored research agreements and found that they don't really present much problem for us in the vast majority of cases.

SGR. *But many investigators have publicly expressed concern about industrial money distorting priorities.*

Varmus. We've been clear in the instructions we've given to the institutions we support with respect to sponsored research agreements, that is that they be short term, discrete, and not large amounts of money. And when they are large amounts of money, they need to come to us and we look at possible conflicts of interest, overlap with the projects we're supporting, potential violations of Bayh-Dole [federal law permitting university ownership of patents from federally financed research]. We expect all of our grantee institutions to subscribe to our guidelines over conflict of interest. What we're particularly concerned with is abuse of trainees by investigators who have the objective of making money.

SGR. *Do you have contingency plans for dealing with a drop in the budget?*

Varmus. We're aware that budgets are likely to tighten and that medical research is, in some global sense, underfunded, because if we were spending a lot more money, things would go faster. So, we are interested in trying to recruit partners. We do support a number of projects as co-funders. This is not simply a matter of coincidentally co-funding certain investigators—that happens all the time. There are certain centers, for example, centers that are co-funded by the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation and by several NIH institutes, and we do similar things with scientific societies and other foundations. I can imagine accelerating our efforts to co-fund through any one of those several mechanisms. But if the budget fortunes changed radically, at least for a couple of years we simply would not be doing anything very new.

SGR. *Would there be a radical change in strategy or would you simply throttle back?*

Varmus. We obviously wouldn't be throttling back equally on all engines. But probably all engines would be throttled back, but not to the same degree. People say, "Why not just decrease the amount you spend on administration?" Well, that means fire people, because our administrative costs are largely salary costs. It is demoralizing for an organization to send people out on so-called RIFs, reductions in force, when you don't know whether you're seeing a limited decrease in the budget or a long-term one. We're also concerned about decreasing administrative costs dramatically at a time when the need for stewardship of our funds is important.

We've made a real effort in the last couple of years to decrease administrative costs. Mr. Porter [Chairman of the NIH House Appropriations Subcommittee] asked for a 7.5 percent decrease in our research-management support money. We achieved that. We're obliged to keep our level at the '96 amount for '97, and we're doing that. Even though we're buying more grants and spending more money, we're not using more staff. But there comes a point at which you can't toss the administrative staff overboard to fund grants.

SGR. *Is there a danger that optimism about AIDS can lead to a reduction of support in Congress?*

Varmus. Those Members of Congress who think about what's happening in the AIDS arena recognize that, though there are some hopeful signs, we have not gotten to the promised land, as yet. I think that everyone recognizes that while AIDS research probably doesn't need to have an increased percentage of the total NIH budget, that there are many new opportunities. It's not just that we've accomplished things. We've created new possibilities for control and treatment of the disease.

SGR. *Recent press reports on the protease inhibitors credit them to industry, with little or no reference to government-supported research. Is this a correct version?*

Varmus. No. Incorrect. I understand it, because what was done in the last few years most visibly has occurred largely within the industrial sector. But, what's important to remember is that we knew that retroviruses have proteases long before we knew about HIV. That work dates to the '70s. We learned that viral proteins were polyproteins that have to be carved up by proteases. There was long investment both by the government and by industry in other kinds of proteases and prospects for inhibiting proteases. A very important feature of research on proteases has been biochemical and structural. The structural work was done in part by industry, but also in large part by government, here at NIH and by government-sponsored scientists on the outside. So, it's been a joint venture. But there's no doubt that industry has placed a tremendous amount of money in the development of these drugs, and they should be saluted for that. But I do get concerned when it appears that the deeper investment, the older investment that was made to allow protease to be recognized as a useful target, is a subject that is ignored by those who are reporting on it.

SGR. *Your own plans?*

Varmus. I've said I would probably do this job for about six years. I'm pretty much at the half-way point now.

Non-Profit Pay Checks

The Federation of American Societies For Experimental Biology

An association of small scientific societies with a total membership of about 46,000, the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB) fills the customary meetings and publications role of scientific bodies. But it's best known in Washington as the insistent lobbying voice of the life scientist at the bench.

FASEB's is a loud, politically attuned voice, mainly focused on the budget and policies of the National Institutes of Health. Just down the road from FASEB headquarters in Bethesda, Md., NIH is the financial mainstay of many of its affiliated members. FASEB also tracks the National Science Foundation, the Department of Agriculture and other federal agencies that support the life sciences, and works closely with the Association of American Medical Colleges to keep federal research budgets up and regulations down.

FASEB and its allies routinely denounce White House budget plans for NIH as miserly and demand real growth—with great effect in recent years. FASEB lionizes Congressmen who deliver the goods, bestowing Public Service Awards for 1996 on two leading appropriators for NIH, Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.) and Sen. Mark Hatfield (R-Oregon).

NIH, though barred from overt political activity, works closely with its hard-lobbying friends, alerting them to problems and issues of common concern and feeding them useful information.

Without direct memberships, FASEB receives $10 per head for each member of the constituent societies. The bulk of its revenues comes from conferences and publication and management services for member societies. FASEB holds non-profit, tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, and as such, is required to make its tax returns available for public inspection upon request.

FASEB runs on a fairly modest budget by the standards of Washington-area scientific organizations. According to FASEB's latest tax return, for calendar year 1995, revenues totaled $11,390,000 and expenses were just a touch behind, at $11,232,000. The 1994 reports substantially higher revenues, $14,540,000, and expenses of $13,858,000. According to FASEB's Comptroller, John R. Rice, the difference from 1994 to 1995 came from changes by the Financial Accounting Standards Board in treatment of contributions and restricted funds. The level of activity, he said, was about the same.

Salaries for senior FASEB employes are toward the lower end of the Washington non-profit scale.

On the form for reporting compensation and benefits for officers and trustees, the only entry on the 1995 return is for Michael J. Jackson, Executive Director: compensation, $197,446; contributions to employe benefit plans and deferred compensation, $20,835.

On the 1994, return, the entries for Jackson are $183,589 and $20,219. No expenses were reported. The FASEB President, Vice President, Treasurer and members of the Board serve without compensation, but are reimbursed for expenses, none of which were listed.

> FASEB comprises 10 societies that hold full-fledged membership:
>
> American Physiological Society, American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, American Society for Investigative Pathology, American Society for Nutritional Sciences, American Association of Immunologists, American Society for Cell Biology, Biophysical Society, American Association of Anatomists, The Protein Society.
>
> Plus two recently admitted Associate Member societies: Society for Developmental Biology, American Peptide Society.

Compensation and benefits for the five highest-paid employes were reported as follows on the 1995 return:

John R. Rice, Comptroller, $132,600; $17,941.

Gar Kaganowich, Director, Office of Public Affairs (who has since left FASEB), $124,800; $17,296.

Geri G. Swindle, Director, Office of Scientific Meetings, $97,700; $15,228.

Lewis I. Gidez, Director, Office of Publications, $94,700; $14,598.

A. Derek Knox, Director, Office of Human Resources, $89,425; $13,739.

FASEB has about 110 employes, of whom 10, in addition to those listed above, were paid over $50,000, according to the 1995; the names of these employes are not required on the tax form.

FASEB's main publication, the *FASEB Journal*, circulation 8000, is predominantly scientific in content, with a smattering of policy and politics. The *FASEB Newsletter*, published nine times a year and distributed to members of the constituent societies, concentrates on Washington affairs.

On the murky topic of lobbying, most scientific societies report negligible spending, though they may, in fact, invest considerable staff resources in pushing their legislative causes. FASEB reports fairly large sums for lobbying in 1995—$224,830 for "lobbying expenditures to influence a legislative body," plus $39,422 for "grassroots lobbying," i.e., activities directed at members of the affiliated societies.

FASEB now has even bigger lobbying plans. Last year, it announced a three-year campaign, at a total cost of $1.5 million, to encourage public and political support for biomedical research [SGR, January 15], in an effort that extends from Capitol Hill to university journalism classes.

Previous Pay Checks: Howard Hughes Medical Institute, April 15; National Academy of Sciences, May 1; American Chemical Society, May 15; American Psychological Association, June 1; American Association for the Advancement of Science, June 15; American Psychiatric Association, July 1; Association of American Medical Colleges, August 1; American Council on Education, September 15; Association of American Universities, October 1; Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, October 15; Heritage Foundation, November 1; American Medical Association, November 15; American Enterprise Institute, December 1.

Next: American Institute of Physics

A Nervous NSF Restates the Criteria for Grants

The National Science Foundation knows its customers out there in grantland, and therefore is proceeding in trembling caution in proposing a restatement of its "merit review criteria" for awarding grants. The uninitiated in these sensitive matters might conclude, however, that the proposed restatement entails little, if any, change at all. But that's no balm for the anxiety in the upper ranks of the Foundation.

The adoption of new language could go through smoothly, or it could set off a storm, SGR was advised by a member of NSF's top policy body, the National Science Board, which requested the restatement. Any change in grant criteria, real or imagined, it was explained, arouses suspicion in the community.

At a specially called briefing for the science press on December 2, NSF Director Neal Lane said that the proposed change exists only in draft form, and the process is now on hold while NSF solicits and awaits comments from the scientific community. Lane emphasized that the proposed language is intended only to clarify the criteria for grants, for the benefit of applicants and NSF program officers. The substance of the rules remain unaltered, he insisted.

"Nothing is broken," Lane said, adding, "We're not trying to fix something." The current merit review criteria, he explained, were written in 1981, long prior to a burgeoning of NSF programs, and the Board felt it was time for a restatement.

So, what's the difference between the old and the new? At present, the criteria are stated in four paragraphs, individually headed "Research performer competence," "Intrinsic merit of the research," "Utility or relevance of the research," and "Effect on the infrastructure of science and engineering."

Each heading is followed by a one-sentence statement. For example, the paragraph for "Research performer competence" states, "This criterion relates to the capability of the investigators, the technical soundness of the proposed approach, and the adequacy of the institutional resources available."

The proposed criteria fold the four paragraphs from 1981 into two paragraphs consisting mainly of questions, beginning with the headings of the two paragraphs: "What is the intellectual merit and quality of the proposed activity?" and "What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?"

Within these paragraphs, questions are focused on such matters as "What is the likelihood that the project will significantly advance the knowledge base within and/or across different fields?" and "How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while concurrently promoting teaching, training and learning?"

Asked whether the proposed change reflects political interest in applied science and quick payoffs from federal R&D spending, Lane pointed out that the 1981 version explicitly identified "improved technology" and "the solution of societal problems" as criteria for awards. There's nothing new here, Lane said, emphasizing again that clarity alone was the motive of the exercise.

For complete texts of old and new and related materials: *NSB and NSF Staff Task Force on Merit Review: Discussion Report* (NSB/MR-96-15), order from: National Science Foundation, Information Center, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1234; Internet: <http://www.nsf.gov>.

Job Changes & Appointments

In the transition to a second Clinton Administration, science is losing two strong supporters in the highest economic posts at the White House. ***Joseph Stiglitz,*** Chairman of the Council of Ecnomic Advisors, announced last week that early next year, he'll become Chief Economist of the World Bank. ***Laura D'Andrea Tyson***, head of the National Economic Council, had announced earlier that she's returning to the University of California, at Berkeley. Both had developed close relations with White House Science and Technology Advisor John Gibbons, and spoke strongly in support of research as a high-return investment.

Steven M. Mirin, Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School and President and Psychiatrist in Chief at McLean Hospital, Belmont, Mass., has been appointed Medical Director of the American Psychiatric Association, succeeding ***Melvin Sabshin***, who has held the position since 1974. Mirin will start work at APA's Washington, DC, headquarters in July and assume the directorship following Sabshin's retirement later in the year. At APA, struggling with managed care on several fronts, Mirin will supervise a staff of 200 and a budget of $28 million.

Cornelia Dean has been appointed Science Editor of the *New York Times*, succeeding ***Nicholas Wade***, who will be reporting on science topics. Dean most recently was Deputy Editor in the *Times'* Washington Bureau and previously was Deputy Science Editor.

At the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP): ***Rick Borchelt***, Special Assistant for Public Affairs, is moving in January to Oak Ridge, Tenn., where he will be Manager of Media Relations for Lockheed Martin, the contractor for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and other nearby Department of Energy facilities. Borchelt was media chief for the House Science Committee until the Republican takeover in January 1995. Also at OSTP, ***Henry Kelly*** is serving as Acting Associate Director for Technology, following the retirement in October of ***Lionel "Skip" Johns***. Kelly and Johns are alumni of the defunct Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, which was headed for many years by OSTP Director John Gibbons.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

From the Independent Women's Forum:

Women's Figures: The Economic Progress of Women in America (58 pp., $7.95), data on women's income, occupational status, education, divorce rates, voting patterns, membership in Congress, etc., by the Forum, a nonprofit research and public-affairs organization. The report is by Diana Furchtgott-Roth, a resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, and Christina Stolba, a PhD candidate in history at Emory University.

Order from: Independent Women's Forum, 2111 Wilson Blvd., Suite 550, Arlington, Va. 22201-3057; tel. 1-800/224-6000 or 703/243-8989; fax 703/243-9230.

From the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO):

The Update (12 pp., no charge), by the latter-day version of the Strategic Defense Initiative (alias Star Wars), quarterly newsletter on civilian tech transfer from anti-missile research. Bearing the slogan "Linking American Businesses to Ballistic Missile Defense Technology," *The Update* reports various success stories and tells how to get in touch with people associated with them. The Fall 1996 issue contains a report on BMDO funding of projects at Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Institutions.

Order from: BMDO, National Technology Transfer Center, Washington Operations, 2121 Eisenhower Ave., Suite 400, Alexandria, Va. 22314; tel. 703/518-8800, ext. 500; fax 703/518-8986.

From the American Cancer Society (ACS):

Cancer Risk Report: Prevention and Control (12 pp., no charge), for a general audience, brief reports on tobacco use and related cancer incidence, dietary factors in cancer, cancer screening reported by states, etc. The report, published annually, draws on data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Order from: Local divisions of the ACS, or from: 1/800-ACS-2345; Internet: <http://www.cancer.org>.

From the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the University of Tennessee Energy, Environment, and Resources Center:

Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy (quarterly; in US, $28 for individuals, $36 for institutions; foreign, $34 for individuals, $42 for institutions), articles, reviews and commentaries on a wide range of topics, among them, in the Winter 1996 issue (152 pp.), conservation of rangelands, lead poisoning, an evaluation of state environmental policies, priority-setting for environmental cleanups, etc. *Forum*, now in its 11th year of publication, has a circulation of about 2000.

Order from: *Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy*, Executive Sciences Institute, 1005 Mississippi Ave., Davenport, Iowa 52803; tel. and fax: 319/324-4463; selected articles on the Internet: <forum@utk.edu>.

SGR Holiday Schedule

The next issue of *Science & Government Report* will be published January 15, 1997.

From the Environmental Law Institute (ELI):

Our National Wetland Heritage: A Protection Guide (160 pp., $29.95), first published in 1983 and frequently reprinted, now in an updated, second edition that discusses developments in legal strategies, incentives and other means for conserving wetlands. The new edition is by Jon Kusler, Executive Director of the Association of State Wetland Managers, and Teresa Opheim, an ELI Senior Attorney and Editor of the ELI *National Wetlands Newsletter*.

Property: Past, Present and Future (36 pp., $10), focused on "regulatory takings," an ELI "research brief" that asserts that individual property rights are limited by the rights of society, including environmental considerations.

Order from: Environmental Law Institute, 1616 P St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036; tel. 202/328-5150; fax 202/328-5002.

From the American Institute of Physics:

1996 Initial Employment Report: Follow-Up of the 1995 Physics Degree Recipients (AIP No. R-282.19a; 4 pp., no charge), a preliminary report stating that unemployment for the 1994-95 PhD crop was a mere 4 percent in the winter following graduation, but among those who had accepted "potentially permanent positions in the US, 45 percent were working outside the field of physics. Of this group, nearly a quarter left the science and technology fields."

Order from: American Institute of Physics, Education and Employment Statistics Division, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, Md. 20740-3843; tel. 301/209-3070; fax 301/209-0843; e-mail: <jcabrera@aip.acp.org>.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, $490.00 ☐
two years, $840.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, $40.00 per year; non-USA surface mail, $20.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill
Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account#_____ Exp.date _____

_____
Signature

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD):

Fiscal Measures to Promote R&D and Innovation (94 pp., no charge) says tax incentives are used by most of the 27 OECD member nations to encourage research and development, and are becoming increasingly important as industrial funds for research decline as a proportion of gross domestic product. In addition, the report states, some provincial and regional governments have instituted their own R&D tax incentives. Separate chapters are included on "National R&D Tax Schemes" in Australia, the US, France, Japan and the Netherlands.

Venture Capital and Innovation (121 pp., no charge), reports that venture-capital markets are not as well developed in Europe and Japan as in the US, where they "are well-established and focused on early-stage investment in technology-based firms." The US markets, the report states, consist of a large range of investors, including individuals, pension funds and insurance companies, whereas European and Japanese venture capital is dominated by banks.

The two reports above are available without charge on the Internet: <http://www.oecd.org/dsti>, and from: OECD, Science and Technology Policy Division, Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry, 2 rue Andre-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France; tel. 33 1 45 24 93 43; fax 33 1 45 24 97 67.

Also from OECD: ***Intellectual Property, Technology Transfer and Genetic Resources: An OECD Survey of Current Practices and Policies*** (86 pp., $16), examines how member nations are responding to issues raised by the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity.

Caring for Frail Elderly People: Policies in Evolution (306 pp., $64), reviews long-term care practices, recent reforms, etc., in Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, UK and US. Among the findings: a decline in long-term hospital beds and traditional old-people's homes, more nursing-home beds and day care and specialized services for the elderly, and a greater involvement of family in long-term care plans.

Order from: OECD Publications and Information Center, 2001 L St. NW, Suite 650, Washington, DC 20036-4922; tel.202/785-6323; fax 202/785-0350; also available from booksellers and OECD offices in major cities around the world.

From the National Academy of Sciences:

Resource Sharing in Biomedical Research (96 pp., $29, plus $4 for shipping), another cost-saving response to hard times, this one from the Institute of Medicine (IOM), health-policy arm of the Academy, offering ideas from a workshop last January on how to squeeze and share more science from existing facilities. In explaining the rationale for the workshop, the report notes that "a number of contemporary observers have commented on an apparent decline in the openness and willingness to share information that has traditionally been viewed as a characteristic feature of science." The report discusses the American Type Culture Collection, the Multinational Coordinated *Arabidopsis Thaliana* Genome Research Project, the Jackson Laboratory, the Washington Regional Primate Center, the Macromolecular Crystallography Resource at the Cornell High Energy Synchrotron Source, and the Human Genome Center: Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. Frederick J. Manning of the IOM staff was Study Director for the project.

Order from: National Academy Press, Lock Box 285, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20055; tel. 1-800/624-6242 or 202/334-3313.

From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:

Federal and State Prisons: Inmate Populations, Costs and Projection Models (GAO/GGD-97-15; 38 pp.), reporting on the fastest-growing item in most state budgets—far outpacing growth in educational expenditures—the GAO says federal and state prison populations expanded at an average annual rate of 8.5 percent from 1980 through 1995. Annual operating costs rose from $3.1 billion in 1980 to $17.7 billion in current dollars in fiscal 1994, for a 15-year total, in operating and capital costs, of $163 billion. During that period, the prison population grew from 330,000 to 1.1 million. The forecast for the year 2000 is 1.4 million inmates. The report was requested by Chairman Bill McCollum (R-Fla.) of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Rep. Charles Schumer, of New York, senior Democrat on the Subcommittee.

Nuclear Safety: Status of US Assistance to Improve the Safety of Soviet-Designed Reactors (GAO/RCED-97-5; 72 pp.), assesses US efforts to improve safety and shut down the riskiest of 60 Soviet-designed reactors in the eastern bloc and former USSR. None has been shut down so far, says the report, while the improved-safety efforts are progressing, though at a slower pace than originally hoped for. The Department of Energy, the lead US agency in the program, estimates costs at $500 million over 10 years, but DOE lacks a long-term plan for carrying it through, the GAO concludes. The report was requested by Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Federal Personnel: Issues on the Need for NOAA's Commissioned Corps (GAO/GGD-97-10; 20 pp.), concludes that "limited savings" would result from further reduction and "civilianization" of the uniformed commissioned corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, down from 400 in October 1994 to 332 in July 1996, with a goal of 285 by the year 2000. The report was requested by Reps. Lamar Smith (R-Texas) and John R. Kasich (R-Ohio).

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

(Continued on Page 7)